



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
200690	10/20/80	Roy Johnson	3427a-8

Robert Armitage and John Kekich  
Pat. Law Dept.  
Upjohn Co.  
Kalamazoo, Mi. 49001

EXAMINER	
B. Dentz	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
121	11

DATE MAILED:

#MAILED

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS, AND TRADEMARKS

JAN 12 1982

ADVISORY ACTION

GROUP 129

- ☐ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS EXTENDED TO RUN \_\_\_\_\_ MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THE FINAL REJECTION.  
855 O.G. 1109.
- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with Rule 192 (a).  
Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed second Dec. 7, 1981, has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under Rule 116(b).
  - b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.
  - c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter.
  - d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☐ Upon the filing of an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be ☐ will not be, entered and the status of the claims in this application would be as follows:
- a. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable.
  - b. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ would not be allowable.
- However:
- (1) ☐ The rejection of claims \_\_\_\_\_ on references is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
  - (2) ☐ The rejection of claims \_\_\_\_\_ on non-reference grounds only is deemed to be overcome by applicant's response.
4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been entered but does not overcome the rejection.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be admitted because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.
6. ☐ The application having been examined under the special accelerated examining procedure (M.P.E.P. 708.02), the proposed amendment has not been considered since it does not prima facie place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

BD  
B. Dentz  
A/C 703  
557-2517  
Dec. 31, 1981

Henry P. Jiles  
Superintendent